

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

CURTIS LUX, et al.,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

JORDANA BUCHANAN, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:23-cv-00839-MMD-NJK

ORDER

[Docket No. 113]

Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' motion to extend the dispositive motion deadline. Docket No. 113; *see also* Docket No. 114 (corrected image). The Court does not require a response or a hearing. *See* Local Rule 78-1. Plaintiffs recently refiled voluminous discovery motions that have not been decided. *See* Docket Nos. 97-100; *see also* Docket No. 96 (striking prior filings for local rules violations). Based on the pendency of those motions, the Court hereby **GRANTS** the motion to extend¹ and **RESETS** the dispositive motion deadline to May 13, 2024.²

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 27, 2024


 Nancy J. Koppe
 United States Magistrate Judge

¹ The motion to extend veers significantly from its central premise, including addressing the details of a cell phone dispute and requesting the deposition of defense counsel, despite the fact that discovery is closed. The motion also makes grand statements that are plainly belied by the record. *Compare* Docket No. 114 at 5 (“All orders have been promptly adhered to by Plaintiffs”) *with* Docket No. 52 (addressing Plaintiffs’ violation of the order to serve initial disclosures). To be crystal clear, the Court is granting an extension based solely on the fact that discovery motions are pending. Nothing herein should be construed as an endorsement of any of the other representations or issues raised in the motion to extend.

² Plaintiffs seek a floating deadline related to the pending discovery motions, but the default is to set a calendar date. *See* Local Rule 26-1(b)(4).